

REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claim 22 has been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-29, and 31-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) on the grounds of anticipation by Shoemaker et al. The Examiner indicated that the prior art allows for a mask to be deflected for storage, which could be any position or orientation in which the mask is ever so slightly deflected. Claim 22 has been amended to recite "said flexible optical lens being capable of deflecting to conform to a wearer's face and to be rolled for storage." Support for the feature that the flexible optical lens of the invention may be rolled for storage can be found in the specification at page 4, lines 29-35; page 7, lines 25-29; and page 9, lines 9-14. Shoemaker et al. discloses at column 4, lines 25-42, that the "Mask 10 is molded of a transparent silicone elastomer in a thickness sufficient to make it semi-rigid to retain its open shape shown in FIG. 1 but with enough resiliency to deflect under urging by optical eyepieces." It is respectfully submitted that Shoemaker et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest a full face oxygen mask that includes a flexible optical lens capable of deflecting to be rolled for storage, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 22-29, and 31-34 are novel and inventive over Shoemaker et al., and that the rejection of Claims 22-29, and 31-34 on the grounds of anticipation by Shoemaker et al. should be withdrawn.

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Shoemaker et al. in view of Aulgur et al. or Dubruille et al., which were cited as teaching

use of an inflatable harness formed of silicone tubing. However, as noted above, it is respectfully submitted that Shoemaker et al., Aulgur et al. and Dubruille et al. do not teach, disclose or suggest a full face oxygen mask that includes a flexible optical lens capable of deflecting to be rolled for storage, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 30 is novel and inventive over Shoemaker et al., Aulgur et al., and Dubruille et al., taken individually or in combination, and that the rejection of Claim 30 on the grounds of obviousness from Shoemaker et al. in view of Aulgur et al. or Dubruille et al. should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By: 

James W. Paul

Registration No. 29,967

JWP:rvw

Encl.: Return Postcard

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201

96299.1

Serial No. 10/671,379
BEAER 65632